

Docket No. F-8636

Ser. No. 10/529,941

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 remain pending in this application. Claims 3-5 and 9 are allowed. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected. Claims 8, 10, and 11 are objected to. Claims 2 and 7 are previously cancelled. Claims 8, 10, and 11 are amended herein to be made independent. Claims 1 and 6 are amended herein to clarify the invention.

Claims 1 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,779,424 (Lyon).

The Office Action states that page 2 that the drawings of the present invention and that of Lyon appear to be different but maintains the rejection over Lyon. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to distinguish over Lyon.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *See Verdegaal Brothers Inc. v. Union Oil Company of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the edges of sloped concave portions are continuous with outer peripheral arcuate segments on the first end of the cylindrical outer face of the cylindrical ring portion and that the edges of the sloped concave portions converge from respective arcuate segments towards the second end of the cylindrical outer face. It is clear from at least Figures 3 and 4 of Lyon that these limitations are

JAN 02 2008

Docket No. F-8636

Ser. No. 10/529,941

absent from the invention of Lyon. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claims 1 and 6 be allowed.

Claims 8 and 10-11 have been objected to as dependent from a rejected claim but deemed allowable. Claims 8 and 10-11 have been made independent to secure their allowance. Applicants respectfully request that claims 8, 10, and 11 be allowed.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify the invention. Support for such amendment being found in, for example, Figures 5 and 6 of the Drawings.

Three further independent claims in excess of three are added. The fee of \$630.00 for the claims is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

01/03/2008 VBUI11 00000019 10529941

01 FC:1201

630.00 00

Docket No. F-8636

Ser. No. 10/529,941

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

By and,

By Ricardo Unikel  
Ricardo Unikel  
Reg. No. 52,309  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038